



Meeting Summary Notes		Department of Health Office of Environmental Health & Safety  <b>Water Quality Workgroup Meeting</b> <i>March 1, 2005</i>	
Facilitator:	Meliss Maxfield	Note Taker(s):	Nancy Bernard
Attendees:	Jim Kerns, ESD 101; Mark Cooper, SRDC Parent; Jack Tinnea, consultant; Diane McMurray, SRDC, WSPTA; Ken Wilson, CSP, Tacoma Public Schools; Don Leaf, WSEHA; Mike Young, Snohomish Health District; Ron English, Seattle Public Schools; and Gary Porter, TPCHD; Gary Jefferis, (Everett SD) SRDC WAMOA; DOH Staff: Meliss Maxfield, Teresa Walker, Mark Soltman, Nancy Bernard, Candi Wines (Olympia, PM)		
Absentees:	Eric Dickson, CIH, ESD 101; Randy Wright, SRDC private schools alternate; Corrine Story, Skagit County Department of Health/Environmental Health Directors; Julie Awbrey, Spokane Regional HD; Dan Sander, DOH; and Paul Clark WAMOA Moses Lake; Wendy Jones, School Nurse Corp, ESD 114; Jim Nilson, Seattle Public Utilities; Joe Eneset, Institute of Environmental Health; and Dan Wessel, Peninsula School District		
Guests:	Kimberly Brown, Seattle Public Schools parent; Sally Soriano, Seattle Public School Board Member		
AGENDA ITEM		DISCUSSION	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of Agenda</li> <li>Review last meeting's summary notes</li> <li>Water Workgroup evaluation sheet</li> <li>Legislative Update</li> </ul> Meliss Maxfield Handouts 1, 2, and 3		<p>A correction is needed to last meeting's summary notes regarding discussion on Legionella. The organization recommending proactive testing of Legionella in hospitals and dormitories is the Association of Higher Education Facilities Operator's (APPA). Also there was a discussion regarding total coliform and Legionella and the notes not accurately reflecting the discussion; however, the decision agenda on these two items will clarify the matter.</p> <p>The senate bill 5029 passed out of committee and is in the Senate Ways and Means committee. Must pass out of Senate Ways and Means by March 16 and go over to the House for consideration. Companion bill house bill 1123 is still in the Health Care committee and must move out of this committee by March 2, otherwise it is dead for the year. Meliss will keep the workgroup member apprised of the status of these two bills.</p> <p>Meliss handed out an evaluation form requesting feedback from workgroup members.</p>	
ACTION		Correct last meeting summary notes to reflect above discussion.	
AGENDA ITEM		DISCUSSION	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision Agenda</li> <li>Handout 4</li> </ul> Mark Soltman		<p>Mark briefed group on the voting process describing how the proposals are intended to capture the points of group discussions where ideas for addressing the problems have come to a general agreement. The group would have the opportunity to fine tune any of the proposal before voting. For each proposal the group identifies through the voting process, those recommended proposals will be forwarded to the School Rule Development committee for consideration.</p> <p>A concern was voiced regarding moving forward with making recommendations when EPA is slated to update their guidance to schools. The concern is adopting state regulations or guidance that may be more stringent than EPA recommendations. EPA may not develop their standards in time for the school rule development time line. Depending on the timing of EPA's guidance and the school rule development, adjustments to the recommendations could still be made. If items make it to rule and then become in conflict with federal standards, then the SBOH &amp; DOH need to adjust. The issue regarding cost of rule implementation was discussed and that not only does the cost of complying with the rule need to be considered but medical bills of incurred by students when conducting the cost benefit analysis and small business impact analysis of the rule.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Decision Agenda - continued	A concern was voiced over the generalization that students are getting ill. Many school districts are testing and taking necessary steps. There is a need for providing funding to schools and for phased compliance.
ACTION	<b>None. Information sharing.</b>
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Decision Agenda - continued	A clarification was made that all the items in the decision agenda pertain to schools that <b>receive</b> their water from another public water system. Those schools that are their own public water system will continue following the Safe Drinking Water Act requirements.
<b>Lead sampling size &amp; action level</b>	See the March 1, 2005 Decision Agenda for details on each recommended proposal.  See above discussion on concerns on adopting more stringent standards than EPA.
ACTION	<b>The workgroup voted on proposals A, B, and C.</b>
<b>Lead sampling location</b>	See the March 1, 2005 Decision Agenda for details on each recommended proposal.  The workgroup discussed a number of issues pertaining to lead sampling location including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plumbing profiles do not have to be done by an engineer.</li> <li>• New schools can have hotspots of lead. Need a way to test all sites, and then retest where problems.</li> <li>• Water coming from the water purveyor can change and effect testing outcomes if it is corrosive.</li> <li>• Sampling every outlet does not include showers or hose bibs; however, some do drink from outside hose bibs, even though it is illegal.</li> <li>• DOH should look at the meta data from all the schools. Build in assurance and cost effectiveness over time and determine sampling locations.</li> </ul> <p>The workgroup also discussed that where consensus was obtained, voting for other proposals was not necessary.</p>
ACTION	<b>The workgroup agreed there was no need to vote on multiple proposals if one was a clearly agreed upon. The workgroup voted on proposal B only.</b>
<b>Lead sampling frequency</b>	The workgroup discussed a number of issues pertaining to sampling frequency including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some fixtures can initially test fine and then have unsatisfactory results later.</li> <li>• If DOH has funding they should conduct pilot studies and from these develop guidance for testing frequency.</li> <li>• Consider sampling on a cycle (e.g. sample each type of fountain, each year).</li> <li>• Everett School District samples on a rotating testing cycle. Generally a 3-5 year rotation of doing an entire site at a cost of \$10,000/year or about 1200 samples (does not include labor).</li> <li>• Protocol changed in Seattle School sampling that caused high results. Their consultants recommended a 3-5 year cycle and they're going to do 30-40 schools/ year, an entire school at a time.</li> <li>• Water purveyors under the lead and copper rule require sampling every three years after initial sampling is ok.</li> <li>• Need to determine baseline before next sampling frequency can be determined</li> <li>• Use sampling results of the sampling from lead and copper rule and have DOH develop a guidance document for schools</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
ACTION	<b>The workgroup voted on proposals A &amp; D only.</b>
<b>Lead reporting/notification of results</b>	<p>The workgroup discussed a number of issues pertaining to reporting and notification of results including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do something similar to Integrated Pest Management, AHERA notification – where to get the information.</li> <li>• A notebook at each school.</li> <li>• Notify parents of any exceedances</li> <li>• Allow school district decide</li> </ul>
ACTION	<b>The workgroup voted on a modified proposal A only.</b>
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<b>Lead Follow-up requirements</b>	<p>The workgroup discussed a number of issues pertaining to follow-up requirements including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better guidance is needed.</li> <li>• Flushing largely discredited because of rebound effect</li> <li>• Recommend DOH develop guidance for remediation actions, methodologies, and follow-up strategies.</li> <li>• Quality control will be needed, depending on the follow-up action taken</li> </ul>
ACTION	<b>The workgroup voted on proposals A &amp; B only.</b>
<b>Copper sampling size &amp; action level</b>   DOH position paper on copper in drinking water  Testimony from parent with children in Seattle Public School District  Handouts 5 and 6	<p>The workgroup discussed a number of issues pertaining to copper sample size and action level including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250 ml vs. 1 liter size.</li> <li>• 250 ml reflects problem with faucet while 1 liter size reflect piping problem.</li> <li>• The lead and copper rule allows 90 percent of the required samples be at or below the action level of both lead and copper. If 1.3 is a health standard, but EPA only requires 90% compliance, what are people buying water suppose to do?</li> <li>• Lead and copper are both health based primary standards.</li> <li>• Recommend DOH develop guidance for sample size.</li> <li>• Consider action level that will not exceed lead and copper rule of 1.3 mg/L.</li> </ul> <p>A workgroup member passed out DOH position paper on copper in drinking water. The issue paper states that if copper is over 1.3, monitor situation for related clusters of gastrointestinal illness.</p>
ACTION	<b>The workgroup voted on proposal B only.</b>
<b>Copper sampling location</b>	<p>The workgroup discussed the following pertaining to copper sample location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test all drinking water sites and fountains.</li> <li>• Prioritize other sampling sites based on potential use and risk.</li> </ul>
ACTION	<b>The workgroup voted on modified proposal B only.</b>
<b>Copper sampling frequency</b>	<p>The workgroup discussed the following pertaining to copper sample frequency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarities to the lead discussion (after initial sampling, when is the next time to sample?).</li> <li>• Copper failures generally due to grounding issues and easily fixed.</li> <li>• New buildings with all copper, if they test clean, they're going to stay clean. Same with old buildings.</li> </ul>
ACTION	<b>The workgroup voted on modified proposal A only.</b>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<b>Copper reporting/notification of results</b>	The workgroup agreed to use the same language developed for lead for copper reporting and notification activities.
<b>ACTION</b>	<b>The workgroup voted on proposal B only.</b>
<b>Copper follow-up requirements</b>	The workgroup agreed to use the same language developed for lead for copper follow-up requirements.
<b>ACTION</b>	<b>The workgroup voted on proposals A &amp; B.</b>
<b>Cadmium sampling size and standard, sampling location, sampling frequency, reporting and notification, plus follow-up requirements</b>	The workgroup agreed to use the language developed for copper for these 5 elements. In addition, if galvanized material was not used, sampling not required.
<b>ACTION</b>	<b>The workgroup voted on proposal C for sampling size and standard, proposal A for sampling location, proposal A for sampling frequency, proposal B for reporting and notification, and proposals A and B for follow-up requirements.</b>
<b>Total coliform sampling</b>	<p>The workgroup discussed the following pertaining to total coliform sampling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine sampling not required.</li> <li>• If cross connections present, eliminate them.</li> <li>• Existing state rules require elimination of cross connections.</li> <li>• Recommend sampling as part of health related complaints.</li> <li>• Local health jurisdictions don't have the ability to require action on secondary standards.</li> <li>• Moved reference to turbid water, water high in iron, or biofilm present to secondary standards proposals.</li> </ul>
<b>ACTION</b>	<b>The workgroup voted on proposals A and C.</b>
<b>Total coliform reporting/notification</b>	<p>The workgroup discussed the following pertaining to total coliform reporting and notification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use existing state protocol on reporting (e.g., 24 hour notification if fecal or <i>E. coli</i> present. 30 day public notification if total coliform present). Also use parent notification.</li> <li>• Use existing school communication methods</li> </ul>
<b>ACTION</b>	<b>The workgroup voted on a modified proposal A.</b>
<b>Total coliform follow-up requirements</b>	<p>The workgroup discussed the following pertaining to total coliform follow-up requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend remediate total coliform issues as directed by state and or local health authorities.</li> </ul>
<b>ACTION</b>	<b>The workgroup voted on a modified proposal B.</b>
Legionella, iron, manganese, color, total dissolved solids, pH, alkalinity, tin, and turbidity	Time did not permit the workgroup to discuss and vote on these proposals. Discussion and voting will occur on March 22.
<b>ACTION</b>	<b>Items deferred to March 22 meeting.</b>

HANDOUTS	NEXT MEETING
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agenda</li> <li>2. February 8 Summary Meeting Notes</li> <li>3. Decision Agenda</li> <li>4. Evaluation Form</li> <li>5. DOH position paper on copper in drinking water</li> <li>6. Testimony from parent with children in Seattle School District</li> </ol>	<p>           Tuesday, March 22, 2005            9:00 am to 3:00 pm            PSES D Burien Office            400 SW 152nd Street            Burien, WA 98166            Switchboard: 206/439-3636  <a href="http://www.doh.wa.gov/ehp/ts/School/s-rdc/buriendirections.htm">http://www.doh.wa.gov/ehp/ts/School/s-rdc/buriendirections.htm</a> </p>